REMARKS

Claims 30-51 have been added. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-21 have been cancelled, without

prejudice. No new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments. Claims 30 -

51 are under examination.

OBJECTIONS

Claims, 3, 13 and 14 were objected to because of the informalities. The objections are

moot in light of the claim cancellations.

REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

35 U.S.C.§ 103

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen

et al, U.S. Patent 6,625,624 (hereinafter Chen) and Mathur et al, U.S. Patent 6,704,807

(hereinafter Mathur) in view of Kapoor, U.S. Patent 6,205,489 (hereinafter Kapoor). The

rejections are moot in light of the claim cancellations, without prejudice.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claim 30 recites that a first proxy on a first server and a second proxy on a

second server maintain a connection via a network. While the connection is maintained a

plurality of first processes on the first server communicate with a corresponding plurality of

second processes on the second server via the connection. The plurality of first processes

exchange data with the first proxy via shared memory, wherein each of the plurality of first

processes is assigned a unique region of the shared memory. The first proxy transmits said data via said connection to said second proxy.

Thus, the embodiment recited in Claim 30 allows a plurality of processes on the first server to communicate with a plurality of processes on the second server, using the same connection that is maintained between the first and second proxy. Moreover, the processes exchange data with the proxy via shared memory. Thus, the embodiment recited in Claim 30, by maintaining the connection between the first and second proxy, and using the maintained connection to allow communication between the plurality of first processes and the plurality of second processes alleviate the need to establish independent, temporary connections between the first processes and corresponding ones of the second processes, or between the first processes and an intermediary, such as a proxy, or between the second processes and an intermediary, such as a proxy.

The prior art fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 30. For example, Chen fails to teach or suggest first and second proxies that maintain a connection, as claimed. In contrast, Chen discloses that in response to receiving a client request, the "iserver class" forwards commands to the "iagent class" for remote Web access. The iagent class 2035 connects to a remote server or proxy to request a web page (col. 3, lines 35 -60). Thus, the iagent class does not maintain a connection with a proxy.

Further, Chen fails to teach or suggest that a plurality of clients communicate over a connection that is maintained between the iagent class and any other node. Thus, Chen fails to teach or suggest, "a plurality of first processes on the first server communicating with a corresponding plurality of second processes on the second server via the connection," as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, New Claim 30 is allowable.

Claim 31 depends from Claim 30, and further limits "the plurality of first processes exchanging data with the first proxy via shared memory." Claim 31 recites, "the first process causing the state of a process mark device to change to a first state to indicate that the region is not writeable by the first process." Claim 32 depends from Claim 31, and further recites, "prior to the first process writing data to the shared memory, the first process determining whether the region of the shared memory is currently writeable by the first process." The prior art fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 31 or Claim 32, at least because one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Chen to arrive at the invention recited in Claim 31 or the invention recited in Claim 32.

Chen teaches that the clients communicate with the proxy via a communication protocol such as HTTP. Chen teaches that <u>advantageously changes are not required to the client or server software or to communication protocols</u> (col. 2, lines 9 – 11). Thus, Chen <u>teaches away</u> from making any modification to Chen that would require a change to client or server software or to communication protocols. However, to arrive at the limitations recited in Claim 31 or the limitations recited in Claim 32, would require modifications to at least one of the client software, the server software, or communication protocols, which <u>Chen teaches away</u> from.

For example, the rejection to Claim 1 asserts that Chen's client is considered to be a process that communicates with a proxy. However, modifying Chen's client such that it causes the state of a process mark device to change to a first state to indicate that the region is not writeable would constitute a change to the client software, the server software or

11

communication protocols, which Chen teaches away from. Further, modifying Chen's client to have it determine whether the region of the shared memory is currently writeable prior to writing data to the shared memory would require a modification to the client software, which Chen teaches away from.

For the foregoing reasons, Claims 31 and 32 are allowable.

New Claims 40 and 43 comprises similar limitations to those discussed in the remarks regarding New Claim 30. Therefore, Claims 40 and 43 are allowable. The remaining claims depend from one of Claims 30, 40, or 43, and are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, the Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: March 14, 2006

Ronald M. Pomerenke
Reg. No. 43,009

2055 Gateway Place, #550
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 414-1080, ext. 210
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on _March 14, 2006_　　by _Trudy Bagdon_

Trudy Bagdon